

PSEUDOSPECTRA OF SEMI-CLASSICAL (PSEUDO)DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS

NILS DENCKER, JOHANNES SJÖSTRAND, AND MACIEJ ZWORSKI

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this note is to show how some results from the theory of partial differential equations apply to the study of *pseudo-spectra* of non-self-adjoint operators which is a topic of current interest in applied mathematics – see [4] and [26].

We will consider operators which arise from the quantization of bounded functions on the phase space $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$. For stronger results in the analytic case we will assume that our functions are holomorphic and bounded in tubular complex neighbourhoods of $T^*\mathbb{R}^n \subset \mathbb{C}^{2n}$.

Let us present the results in a typical example to which they apply. We consider

$$P(h) = -h^2\Delta + V(x),$$

a semi-classical Schrödinger operator.

We define the *semi-classical pseudospectrum* of the Schrödinger operator $P(h)$ as

$$\Lambda(p) = \overline{\{\xi^2 + V(x) : (x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}, \operatorname{Im}\langle \xi, V'(x) \rangle \neq 0\}},$$

noting that in the analytic case $\Lambda(p)$ is either empty or the closure of the set of all values of $p = \xi^2 + V(x)$.

The following result (see §3) shows that the resolvent is large inside the pseudo-spectrum. We first state it in the case of Schrödinger operators satisfying the assumptions above:

Theorem 1. *Suppose that $P(h) = -h^2\Delta + V(x)$, with $V \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Then, there exists an open dense subset of $\Lambda(p)$ such that for any z in that subset there exists $u(h) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with the property

$$(1.1) \quad \|(P(h) - z)u(h)\| = \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)\|u(h)\|.$$

In addition $u(h)$ is localized to a point in phase space, (x, ξ) , with $p(x, \xi) = z$. More precisely, $WF_h(u) = \{(x, \xi)\}$, where the wave front set, $WF_h(u)$, is defined in (2.5). Finally, for every compact $K \Subset \Lambda(p)$ the above result holds uniformly for $z \in K$ in the natural sense. If the potential is real analytic then we can replace h^∞ by $\exp(-1/Ch)$.

This result was proved by Davies [3] for Schrödinger operators in one dimension, but as was pointed out in [29], it follows in great generality from a simple adaptation of the now classical results of Hörmander [11] and Duistermaat-Sjöstrand [6]. The main point is that, unlike in the case of normal operators, the resolvent can be large on open sets as $h \rightarrow 0$. That is particularly striking when $P(h)$ has only discrete spectrum.

To guarantee that we can for instance assume that

$$(1.2) \quad |\partial_x^\alpha V(x)| \leq C_\alpha(1 + |x|)^{m-|\alpha|}, \quad (1 + |x|^m + |\xi|^2)/C \leq |\xi^2 + V(x)|, \quad |(x, \xi)| \geq C,$$

where $m > 0$. This is the simplest example of the behaviour of the potential: we can make weaker assumptions on V – see the end of Sect.3. In the analytic case, we assume that (1.2) holds as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, $|\operatorname{Im} x| < c_0$ (and we only need it with $|\alpha| = 0$).

The classical symbol $p = \xi^2 + V(x)$ avoids all sufficiently negative values and the Fredholm theory guarantees that $P(h)$ has discrete spectrum for h small enough (see §2).

We can, in place of the Schrödinger operator, $P(h)$, consider the operator with a bounded symbol, $(P(h) - z_1)^{-1}(P(h) - z_2)$, $z_2 \neq z_1$, and this shows that it is sufficient to consider quantization of bounded functions, with all derivatives bounded,

$$p \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^n) = \{u \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^n) : \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \partial^\alpha u \in L^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^n)\}.$$

In that case we give a more general definition of the semi-classical pseudospectrum:

$$(1.3) \quad \Lambda(p) = \overline{p(\{m \in T^*\mathbb{R}^n : \{p, \bar{p}\}(m) \neq 0\})},$$

where we used the Poisson bracket:

$$\{f, g\} = H_f g, \quad H_f \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j=1}^n \partial_{\xi_j} f \partial_{x_j} - \partial_{x_j} f \partial_{\xi_j}.$$

The non-vanishing of $\{p, \bar{p}\}$ is a classical equivalent of the operator not being normal – see (2.3) and (2.4) below. We note that in the analytic case we have

$$\Lambda(p) = \emptyset \quad \text{or} \quad \Lambda(p) = \Sigma(p),$$

where we put

$$\Sigma(p) = \overline{p(T^*\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

In that more general setting we can restate our result as

Theorem 2. *Suppose that $n \geq 2$, $p \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^n)$ and that $p^{-1}(z)$ is compact for a dense set of values $z \in \mathbb{C}$. If $P(h)$ has the principal part given by $p^w(x, hD)$ then the conclusions of Theorem 1 hold.*

If in addition p has a bounded holomorphic continuation to $\{(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{C}^{2n}, |\text{Im}(x, \xi)| \leq 1/C\}$ then the conclusions of Theorem 1 hold with h^∞ replaced by $\exp(-1/Ch)$.

If $n = 1$ then the same conclusion holds provided that the assumptions of Lemma 3.2' are satisfied.

We will see in §4 that, in general, we cannot construct an almost solution $u(h)$ at an arbitrary interior point of $\Lambda(p)$, z .

In simple one dimensional examples we can already see that the spectrum, $\sigma(P(h))$, typically lies deep inside the pseudo-spectrum, $\Lambda(p)$ (the set of values of p in the analytic case) – see [2],[3],[26]. Consider for instance the following non-self-adjoint operator $P(h) = (hD_x)^2 + i(hD_x) + x^2$. A formal conjugation

$$e^{-x/2h} P(h) e^{x/2h} = (hD_x)^2 + x^2 + \frac{1}{4},$$

shows that the spectrum of $P(h)$ is given by $(2n+1)h + 1/4$, while

$$\Lambda(p) = \{z : \text{Re } z \geq (\text{Im } z)^2\}, \quad p = \xi^2 + i\xi + x^2.$$

To see these phenomena for general operators we need to make assumptions on $z_0 \in \partial\Lambda(p)$. The first one is the principal type condition,

$$(1.4) \quad p(x, \xi) = z_0 \implies dp(x, \xi) \neq 0, \quad m \in T^*\mathbb{R}^n.$$

Then we assume an exterior cone condition:

There exists a truncated cone in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Lambda(p)$ with vertex at z_0 .

More precisely,

$$(1.5) \quad \exists \epsilon_0 > 0, \theta_0 \in \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } (z_0 + (0, \epsilon_0)e^{i(\theta_0 - \epsilon_0, \theta_0 + \epsilon_0)}) \cap \Lambda(p) = \emptyset,$$

and a dynamical condition: if $q = ie^{-i\theta_0}(p - z_0)$, then

$$(1.6) \quad \text{No trajectory of } H_{\text{Re } q} \text{ can remain in } q^{-1}(0) \text{ for an unbounded period of time.}$$

Under these conditions we have the following

Theorem 3. *Suppose that $p \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^n)$ and that the principal part of $P(h)$ is given by $p^w(x, hD)$. If $z_0 \in \partial\Lambda(p)$ satisfies (1.4), (1.5), and (1.6) then for any $M > 0$, and for $h < h_0(M)$, $0 < h_0(M)$,*

$$\{z : |z - z_0| < Mh \log(1/h)\} \cap \sigma(P(h)) = \emptyset.$$

If in addition p is a bounded holomorphic function in a complex tubular of $\mathbb{R}^n$. then there exists $C_0 > 0$ such that

$$\{z : |z - z_0| < 1/C_0\} \cap \sigma(P(h)) = \emptyset.$$

In §6 we will show that if (1.6) is violated then, for a large class of *dissipative operators*, the spectrum lies arbitrarily close (as $h \rightarrow 0$) to the boundary of the pseudo-spectrum.

At the boundary of the pseudo-spectrum we may expect an improved bound on the resolvent when some additional non-degeneracy is assumed. The result below is based on subelliptic estimates [14, Chapter 27] and we borrow our notation from there. If $p = p_1 + ip_2 \in C^\infty$ with real valued p_j then we define the repeated Poisson brackets

$$p_I = H_{p_{i_1}} H_{p_{i_2}} \dots H_{p_{i_{k-1}}} p_{i_k}$$

where $I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k) \in \{1, 2\}^k$ and $|I| = k$ is the order of the bracket.

We say that $z_0 \in \partial\Lambda(p)$ is of *finite type* for p if (1.4) holds at z_0 , $p^{-1}(z_0)$ is compact, and for any $(x_0, \xi_0) \in p^{-1}(z_0)$ there exists $k \geq 1$ and $I \in \{1, 2\}^k$ such that

$$(1.7) \quad p_I(x_0, \xi_0) \neq 0.$$

The *order* of p at $w = (x_0, \xi_0)$ is

$$(1.8) \quad k(w) = \max \{j \in \mathbb{Z} : p_I(w) = 0 \text{ for } |I| \leq j\}.$$

The order of z_0 is the maximum of the order of p at (x_0, ξ_0) for $(x_0, \xi_0) \in p^{-1}(z_0)$. We say that p satisfies condition (P) if the imaginary part of qp does not change sign on the bicharacteristics of the real part of qp , for any $0 \neq q \in C^\infty$.

As shown in [14, Corollary 27.2.4], $k(w) > k$ if and only if

$$(1.9) \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{C}, j \leq k \quad (H_{\text{Re } zp})^j \text{Im } zp(w) = 0,$$

and this provides a reformulation of the assumptions of the following

Theorem 4. *Assume that $p \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^n)$, and that the principal part of $P(h)$ is $p^w(x, hD)$. If $z_0 \in \partial\Lambda(p)$ is of finite type for p of order $k \geq 1$, then k is even and for $h < h_0$, $0 < h_0$,*

$$(1.10) \quad \|(P(h) - z_0)^{-1}\| \leq Ch^{-\frac{k}{k+1}},$$

In particular, there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$(1.11) \quad \left\{ z : |z - z_0| \leq c_0 h^{\frac{k}{k+1}} \right\} \cap \sigma(P(h)) = \emptyset \quad 0 < h \leq h_0.$$

In one dimension this result was proved in [31], and in some special cases by Boulton [1] who also showed that the bounds are optimal. As was demonstrated by Trefethen [27] that is also easy to see numerically.

A simple higher dimensional example to which the theorem applies can be constructed as follows. Let $W \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be a non-negative function, vanishing on the circle $x_1^2 + x_2^2 = 1$. Consider

$$P(h) = -h^2 \Delta + iW(x) + i(x_1^2 + x_2^2 - 1)^m, \quad \text{with } m \text{ even.}$$

Then the estimate (1.10) holds for $z_0 > 0$ uniformly on compact subsets of $(0, \infty)$, with $k = 2m$. The increase in k is due to the (simple) tangency of some bicharacteristics of the real part to the set where the imaginary part vanishes.

We conclude by pointing out that we could have defined the semi-classical pseudospectrum of $P(h)$, $\Lambda(P)$, as the closure of the set of points z at which (1.1) holds. We have shown that

$$\Sigma(p) \supset \Lambda(P) \supset \Lambda(p).$$

An equality is not true in general but we could perhaps hope for

$$\overline{\Lambda(P)^\circ} = \Lambda(p),$$

under suitable assumptions.

Another important topic not explored in this paper is the behaviour of evolution operators $\exp(itP/h)$ for non-normal P 's, and its relation to semi-classical pseudospectra.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. The third author is grateful to the National Science Foundation for partial support under the grant DMS-0200732. He would also like to thank Mike Christ and Nick Trefethen for helpful discussion.

2. REVIEW OF SEMI-CLASSICAL QUANTIZATION

For simplicity of presentation we will consider the case of semi-classical quantization of functions $p \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^n)$, that is that p is bounded with bounded derivatives of all orders.

In the analytic case we will assume that $p(x, \xi)$ is bounded and holomorphic in a tubular neighbourhood of $T^*\mathbb{R}^n \simeq \mathbb{R}^{2n} \subset \mathbb{C}^{2n}$. As pointed out in the introduction, the case of functions which omit a value in $\mathbb{C}$ and which tend to infinity as $(x, \xi) \rightarrow \infty$ can be reduced to this case (see also the remark at the end of §3).

We use the Weyl quantization,

$$(2.1) \quad p^w(x, hD_x)u = \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n} \int \int p\left(\frac{x+y}{2}, \xi\right) e^{\frac{i}{h}\langle x-y, \xi \rangle} u(y) dy d\xi.$$

which for $p \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^n)$ gives operators bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ – see [5, Chapter 7]. We can consider more general operators,

$$P(h) \sim \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} h^j p_j^w(x, hD),$$

where in the case of analytic symbols we assume that

$$P(x, \xi; h) \sim \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} h^j p_j(x, \xi),$$

in the space of bounded holomorphic functions in a tubular neighbourhood of the real phase space. Although it is not strictly speaking necessary for our final conclusions, in the analytic

case we make an additional assumption that

$$(2.2) \quad |p_j(z, \zeta)| \leq C^j j^j, \quad (z, \zeta) \in \mathbb{C}^n, \quad |\operatorname{Im}(z, \zeta)| \leq 1/C.$$

That allows us exponentially small errors in the expansions.

The product formula of the Weyl calculus says that

$$(2.3) \quad p_1^w(x, hD) \circ p_2^w(x, hD) = (p_1 \#_h p_2)^w(x, hD; h),$$

where

$$(p_1 \# p_2)(x, \xi; h) = e^{\frac{i\hbar}{2} \omega((D_x, D_\xi), (D_y, D_\eta))} p_1(x, \xi) p_2(y, \eta)|_{y=x, \eta=\xi}$$

has the following asymptotic expansion

$$(2.4) \quad p_1 \#_h p_2(x, \xi; h) \sim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \left(\frac{i\hbar}{2} \omega((D_x, D_\xi), (D_y, D_\eta)) \right)^k p_1(x, \xi) p_2(y, \eta)|_{y=x, \eta=\xi},$$

with $\omega = \sum_{j=1}^n d\xi_j \wedge dx_j$, the symplectic form on $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$, and $D_\bullet = (1/i)\partial_\bullet$. The expansion determines $p_1 \#_h p_2$ up to a term in $\mathcal{O}(h^\infty) \mathcal{C}_b^\infty$. In the analytic case by summing up to $k \sim 1/(Ch)$ we can obtain $\mathcal{O}(e^{-1/(Ch)})$ errors – see [20].

A basic tool of microlocal analysis is the FBI transform:

$$T : L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^2(T^*\mathbb{R}^n),$$

defined by

$$Tu(x, \xi) = c_n h^{-\frac{3n}{4}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} (\langle x-y, \xi \rangle + i|x-y|^2/2)} u(y) dy.$$

Roughly speaking its rôle can be described as follows. The phase space properties of $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are reflected by the behaviour of $Tu \in L^2(T^*\mathbb{R}^n)$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. In this note we will only deal with h -dependent smooth functions with a tempered behaviour, $|D^\alpha u| = \mathcal{O}(h^{-N_\alpha})$. The notion of the *wave front set* of u , $WF_h(u)$, explains the localization statement in Theorem 2 (see also Theorem 2' below). In the $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ case the h -wavefront set is defined by

$$(2.5) \quad (x^0, \xi^0) \notin WF_h(u) \iff \forall N \quad |Tu(x, \xi)| \leq C_N h^{-N} \text{ for } (x, \xi) \text{ in a neighbourhood of } (x^0, \xi^0),$$

and in the analytic case by

$$(2.6) \quad (x^0, \xi^0) \notin WF_h(u) \iff \exists c > 0 \quad |Tu(x, \xi)| \leq e^{-c/h} \text{ for } (x, \xi) \text{ in a neighbourhood of } (x^0, \xi^0).$$

In the $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ case we can also characterize $WF_h(u)$ using pseudodifferential operators:

$$(x^0, \xi^0) \notin WF_h(u) \iff \exists p \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^n), \quad p(x^0, \xi^0) \neq 0, \quad p(x, hD)u = \mathcal{O}(h^\infty).$$

In the analytic case we will need to understand the action of $P(h)$ on microlocally weighted spaces $H(\Lambda_{tG})$ whose definition, in the simple setting needed here, we will now recall – see [9] for the origins of the method, and [17] for a recent presentation.

The complexification of the symplectic manifold $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$, $T^*\mathbb{C}^n$ is equipped with the complex symplectic form, $\omega_{\mathbb{C}}$ and two natural real symplectic forms $\operatorname{Im} \omega_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\operatorname{Re} \omega_{\mathbb{C}}$. We see that $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ is Lagrangian with respect to the first form and symplectic with respect to the second one. In general we call a submanifold satisfying these two conditions an *IR-manifold*.

Suppose that $G \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^n)$. We associate to it a natural family of IR-manifolds:

$$(2.7) \quad \Lambda_{tG} = \{\rho + itH_G(\rho) : \rho \in T^*\mathbb{R}^n\} \subset T^*\mathbb{C}^n, \quad \text{with } t \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } |t| \text{ small.}$$

Since $\operatorname{Im}(\zeta dz)$ is closed on Λ_{tG} , there exists a function H_t on Λ_{tG} such that

$$dH_t = -\operatorname{Im}(\zeta dz)|_{\Lambda_{tG}},$$

and in fact we can write it down explicitly, parametrizing Λ_{tG} by $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$:

$$H_t(z, \zeta) = -\langle \xi, t\nabla_\xi G(x, \xi) \rangle + tG(x, \xi), \quad (z, \zeta) = (x, \xi) + itH_G(x, \xi).$$

The associated spaces $H(\Lambda_{tG})$ are defined as follows. The FBI transform, $Tu(x, \xi)$, is analytic in (x, ξ) and we can continue it to Λ_{tG} . That defines $T_{\Lambda_{tG}}u \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_{tG})$. Since Λ_{tG} differs from $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ on a compact set only, $T_{\Lambda_{tG}}u$ is square integrable on Λ_{tG} .

The spaces $H(\Lambda_{tG})$ are defined by putting h -dependent norms on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$:

$$\|u\|_{H(\Lambda_{tG})}^2 = \int_{\Lambda_{tG}} |T_{\Lambda_{tG}}u(z, \zeta)|^2 e^{-2H_t(z, \zeta)/h} (\omega|_{\Lambda_{tG}})^n / n!.$$

The main result relates the action of a pseudodifferential operator to the multiplication by its symbol. Suppose that p_1 and p_2 are bounded and holomorphic in a neighbourhood of $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ in $\mathbb{C}^{2n}$ (see (2.2)). Then for t small enough

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle p_1^w(x, hD)u, p_2^w(x, hD)v \rangle_{H(\Lambda_{tG})} &= \langle (p_1|_{\Lambda_{tG}})T_{\Lambda_{tG}}u, (p_2|_{\Lambda_{tG}})T_{\Lambda_{tG}}v \rangle_{L^2(\Lambda_{tG}, e^{-2H_t/h}(\omega|_{\Lambda_{tG}})^n/n!)} \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}(h)\|u\|_{H(\Lambda_{tG})}\|v\|_{H(\Lambda_{tG})}, \end{aligned}$$

see [9],[17]. In particular, by taking $p_1 = p$ and $p_2 = \bar{p}$, and $u = v$ we obtain

$$(2.9) \quad \|p^w(x, hD)u\|_{H(\Lambda_{tG})}^2 = \|p|_{\Lambda_{tG}}T_{\Lambda_{tG}}u\|_{L^2(\Lambda_{tG}, e^{-2H_t/h}(\omega|_{\Lambda_{tG}})^n/n!)}^2 + \mathcal{O}(h)\|u\|_{H(\Lambda_{tG})}^2.$$

For the use in the next section we also recall some basic facts about *positive Lagrangian submanifolds* of a complex symplectic manifold $T^*\mathbb{C}^n$. A complex plane λ , of (complex) dimension n is Lagrangian and positive if

$$(2.10) \quad \forall X, Y \in \lambda \quad \omega_{\mathbb{C}}(X, Y) = 0, \quad i\omega_{\mathbb{C}}(\bar{X}, X) \geq 0.$$

The crucial characterization is given as follows (see [14, Proposition 21.5.9]):

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda \subset T^*\mathbb{C}^n \text{ is a positive Lagrangian plane} &\iff \lambda = \{(z, Az) : z \in \mathbb{C}^n\} \\ \text{where } A = A_1 + iA_2 \text{ is a symmetric matrix with } A_1 \text{ real, and } A_2 \text{ positive definite.} \end{aligned}$$

3. SEMI-CLASSICAL PSEUDO-SPECTRUM

In §1 we defined the semi-classical pseudospectrum, $\Lambda(p)$, as the closure of the set of values of p . We define some additional sets

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \Lambda_{\pm}(p) &= \{p(x, \xi) : \pm\{\operatorname{Re} p, \operatorname{Im} p\}(x, \xi) > 0\} \subset p(T^*\mathbb{R}^n) \\ \Sigma_{\infty}(p) &= \{z : \exists (x_j, \xi_j) \rightarrow \infty \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} p(x_j, \xi_j) = z\}, \end{aligned}$$

that is, $\Sigma_{\infty}(p)$ is the set of limit points of p at infinity.

In the $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ case Theorem (2) follows immediately from a semi-classical reformulation of the non-propagation of singularities [6],[11],[12] – see [14, Section 26.3] and [29].

The analytic case is also well known (see [15]) but since a ready-to-use reference is not available we include a proof. It can also be adapted to give a self-contained proof in the $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ case.

Theorem 2'. *Suppose that $n \geq 2$ and $p(x, \xi)$ satisfies the assumptions in §2 in the analytic case, and that $\Lambda_{-}(p)$ is given by (3.1). Then*

$$\overline{\Lambda_{-}(p)} \supset \Lambda(p) \setminus \Sigma_{\infty}(p),$$

and for every $z \in \Lambda_{-}(p)$, and every $(x^0, \xi^0) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ with

$$p(x^0, \xi^0) = z, \quad \{\operatorname{Re} p, \operatorname{Im} p\}(x^0, \xi^0) < 0,$$

there exists $0 \neq u(h) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$(3.2) \quad \|(P(h) - z)u(h)\| = \mathcal{O}(e^{-1/C^h})\|u(h)\|, \quad WF_h(u(h)) = \{(x^0, \xi^0)\}.$$

If $n = 1$ then the same conclusion holds provided that the assumptions of Lemma 3.2' are satisfied. In dimension one the theorem holds as well but further assumptions need to be made on p – see the remark after Lemma 3.2.

Before the proof we want to stress the need for an open dense subset $\Lambda_-(p)$. One could ask if any interior point of $\Lambda(p) \setminus \Sigma_\infty(p)$ is an “almost eigenvalue” or “quasimode” in the sense of (3.2). That is not so as shown by

Example. Consider the following bounded analytic function on $T^*\mathbb{R}$:

$$p(x, \xi) = \frac{\xi^2 - 1 + i\xi x^2(1 + x^2)^{-1}}{1 + \xi^2 + i\xi x^2(1 + x^2)^{-1}}.$$

We see that $p^{-1}(0) = \{(0, 1), (0, -1)\}$, and that 0 is an interior point of the pseudospectrum, $0 \in \Lambda(p)^\circ$. Also, 0 is a boundary point of images of neighbourhoods of $(0, \pm 1)$ under p .

Near $(0, \pm 1)$, p is microlocally equivalent to a non-vanishing multiple of $\xi + ix^2$. An explicit computation shows that the inverse of the models are bounded by $h^{-\frac{2}{3}}$, and a localization argument[†] then shows that

$$\|p^w(x, hD)^{-1}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq h^{-\frac{2}{3}}.$$

Hence, 0 is not a quasi-mode. It should be stressed that the vanishing of the Poisson bracket $\{\text{Re } p, \text{Im } p\}$ (which occurs in this example at $p^{-1}(0)$) is not enough to guarantee the absence of a quasi-mode. A violation of the condition $\overline{\Psi}$ (see [14, Sect.26.4]) can produce quasi-modes with the simplest example coming from adapting [14, Theorem 26.3.6] as in [29]: $p(x, \xi) = \xi - ix^k$, with $k > 1$ odd.

We start the proof of Theorem 2' with the discussion of $\Lambda_\pm(p)$. To establish that $\Lambda_-(p)$ is dense we need the following result of Melin-Sjöstrand [19, Lemma 8.1]:

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that $n \geq 2$ and that $d\text{Re } p, d\text{Im } p$ are linearly independent on $p^{-1}(z)$. If ω is the symplectic form on $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ then*

$$\{\text{Re } p, \text{Im } p\}_{\lambda_{p,z}} = \frac{\omega^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} \Big|_{p^{-1}(z)},$$

where $\lambda_{p,z}$ is the Liouville measure on $p^{-1}(z)$: $\lambda_{p,z} \wedge d\text{Re } p \wedge d\text{Im } p = \omega^n/n!$.

In particular, for any compact connected component of $p^{-1}(z)$, Γ , we have

$$\int_\Gamma \{\text{Re } p, \text{Im } p\}_{\lambda_{p,z}}(d\rho) = 0.$$

As an immediate consequence we see that $\overline{\Lambda_-(p)} = \Lambda(p)$ if the assumptions of Theorem 2 are satisfied and that in general we have the following

Lemma 3.2. *If the assumptions on p are satisfied, $n \geq 2$, and either $\Lambda_+(p)$ or $\Lambda_-(p)$ are non-empty, then $\Lambda_+(p) \cup \Lambda_-(p)$ is dense in $\Lambda(p)$, and*

$$\overline{\Lambda_\pm(p)} \supset \Lambda(p) \setminus \Sigma_\infty(p).$$

[†]It is an easy one dimensional version of the argument in §5.

Proof. Assume that $\{\operatorname{Re} p, \operatorname{Im} p\} \neq 0$. Then $H \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\rho \in T^*\mathbb{R}^n; \{\operatorname{Re} p, \operatorname{Im} p\}(\rho) = 0\}$ is an analytic hypersurface without any interior points. Consequently, every value $z = p(\rho)$ with $\rho \in H$ can be approximated by values $z_j = p(\rho_j)$ with $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \setminus H \ni \rho_j \rightarrow \rho$, and $\Lambda_+(p) \cup \Lambda_-(p)$ is open and dense in $p(T^*\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Since under our assumption $(p(T^*\mathbb{R}^n))^\circ \neq \emptyset$, an elementary version of the Morse-Sard theorem implies that $d\operatorname{Re} p$ and $d\operatorname{Im} p$ are independent on $p^{-1}(z)$ for z in a dense open set $\Omega \subset \Lambda(p) \setminus \Sigma_\infty(p)$. Lemma 3.1 then shows that $\Lambda_+(p) \cap \Omega = \Lambda_-(p) \cap \Omega$, completing the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Remark. In the case of dimension one a different argument, based on elementary topological considerations, is needed and some assumptions have to be made on p . To see that consider for instance

$$p(x, \xi) = \frac{(\xi + ix)^2}{1 + x^2 + \xi^2}, \quad \{\operatorname{Re} p, \operatorname{Im} p\}(x, \xi) > 0, \quad (x, \xi) \neq (0, 0).$$

For p 's arising from Schrödinger operators considered in §1 we always have

$$(3.3) \quad \sum_{m \in p^{-1}(z)} \operatorname{sgn} \{\operatorname{Re} p, \operatorname{Im} p\}(m) = 0,$$

for a dense set of values z . In fact, $p(x, \xi) = p(x, -\xi) = z$, and the set of values z corresponding to $\xi \neq 0$ is dense in the set of values for which the bracket is non-zero. Now we simply notice that

$$\{\operatorname{Re} p, \operatorname{Im} p\}((x, \xi)) = -\{\operatorname{Re} p, \operatorname{Im} p\}((x, -\xi)).$$

Lemma 3.2'. *Suppose that $n = 1$ and in addition to the general assumptions, each component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Sigma_\infty(p)$ has a non-empty intersection with $\mathbb{C}\Lambda(p)$. Then the conclusions of Lemma 3.2 and (3.3) (for a dense set of values) hold.*

Proof. Let Ω be a component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Sigma_\infty(p)$. Then

$$\iota \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \operatorname{var} \arg_{\gamma(z)}(p - z)$$

is independent of $z \in \Omega$ if $\gamma(z)$ is the positively oriented circle $|(x, \xi)| = R(z)$ with $R(z)$ large enough. For $z \in \Omega \setminus \Lambda(p)$ ι is zero (for mapping degree reasons) and hence it is zero for all $z \in \Omega$. If $z \in \Lambda(p) \cap \Omega$ is a regular value, we get

$$0 = \iota = 2\pi \sum_{m \in p^{-1}(z)} \operatorname{sgn} \{\operatorname{Re} p, \operatorname{Im} p\}(m),$$

so z belongs to both $\Lambda_+(p)$ and $\Lambda_-(p)$. $\square$

In the remainder of the proof there is no restriction on the dimension.

Proof of Theorem 2': We can assume that $z = 0$ and we follow the now standard procedure of the *complex WKB construction* associated to a positive Lagrangian submanifold of the complexification of $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$. We start with the geometric construction of that submanifold. Since $\{\operatorname{Re} p, \operatorname{Im} p\} \neq 0$ we have $d_\xi p \neq 0$, and we can assume that $\partial_{\xi_1} p(x^0, \xi^0) \neq 0$. Let ϕ_0 , be a real analytic function defined in a neighbourhood of $y^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, $x^0 = (x_1^0, y^0)$, with the properties

$$\phi_0(y^0) = 0, \quad d\phi_0(y^0) = \eta^0, \quad \xi^0 = (\xi_1^0, \eta^0), \quad \operatorname{Im} d^2 \phi_0(y^0) \gg 0,$$

where the Hessian $d^2 \operatorname{Im} \phi_0$ is well defined at y^0 as $d \operatorname{Im} \phi_0 = 0$. We will make further assumptions on ϕ_0 later.

We then define $\Lambda_0 \subset T^*\mathbb{C}^n$, locally near (x^0, ξ^0) , as follows

$$\Lambda_0 = \{(x_1^0, y; \xi_1(y), d_y \phi_0(y)) : p(x_1^0, y; \xi_1(y), d_y \phi_0(y)) = 0, \xi_1^0(y^0) = \xi_1^0\},$$

where we know that the function $\xi_1(y)$ is locally defined and analytic from our condition $\partial_{\xi_1} p \neq 0$. Using holomorphic continuation we obtain a locally defined submanifold of $T^*\mathbb{C}^n$, $\Lambda_0 \cap T^*\mathbb{R}^n = \{(x^0, \xi^0)\}$. This submanifold is isotropic with respect to the complex symplectic form and its tangent spaces[‡] are positive, in the sense that (2.10) is satisfied without the condition on the dimension.

For $t \in \mathbb{C}$, $|t| < \epsilon$, the complex flow, Φ_t , exists by the Cauchy-Kovalevskaya Theorem:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_t(z, \zeta) &= (z(t), \zeta(t)), \quad z(0) = z, \quad \zeta(0) = \zeta, \\ z'(t) &= \partial_{\zeta} p(z(t), \zeta(t)), \quad \zeta'(t) = -\partial_z p(z(t), \zeta(t)), \end{aligned}$$

that is $d/dt(z(t), \zeta(t)) = H_p(z(t), \zeta(t))$, $\omega_{\mathbb{C}}(\bullet, H_p) = dp$.

We then define

$$\Lambda = \bigcup_{t \in \mathbb{C}, |t| < \epsilon} \Phi_t(\Lambda_0) \subset T^*\mathbb{C}^n,$$

which is Lagrangian with respect to $\omega_{\mathbb{C}}$.

We now want to guarantee that tangent spaces to Λ are positive in the sense of (2.10). We first note that

$$i\omega_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{tH_p}, tH_p) = i|t|^2 \{\bar{p}, p\} = -2\{\operatorname{Re} p, \operatorname{Im} p\}|t|^2 > \gamma|t|^2 > 0,$$

by the assumptions of the theorem. We have

$$\begin{aligned} T_{(x^0, \xi^0)} \Lambda &= T_{(x^0, \xi^0)} \Lambda_0 + \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{C}} H_p(x^0, \xi^0), \\ i\omega_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{X + tH_p}, X + tH_p) &= i\omega_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{X}, X) + 2\operatorname{Im}(tdp^*(X)) + |t|^2 i\omega_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{H_p}, H_p), \end{aligned}$$

where $p^*(\rho) = \overline{p(\bar{\rho})}$. Hence, for positivity, we need to show that we can choose ϕ_0 so that for $X \in T_{(x^0, \xi^0)} \Lambda_0$,

$$|dp^*(X)|^2 < \alpha i\omega_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{X}, X), \quad \alpha = -2\{\operatorname{Re} p, \operatorname{Im} p\}(x^0, \xi^0).$$

A calculation in local coordinates $(z_1, z'; \zeta_1, \zeta')$ shows that this follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \|A + \Phi B\|^2 &< \alpha \min \operatorname{Spec}(\operatorname{Im} \Phi), \\ \Phi &= \phi_0'', \quad A = |p'_{\zeta_1}|^{-1} i (p_{\zeta_1} \bar{p}_{z'} - \bar{p}_{\zeta_1} p_{z'}), \quad B = |p'_{\zeta_1}|^{-1} i (p'_{\zeta_1} \bar{p}_{\zeta'} - \bar{p}_{\zeta_1} p_{\zeta'}). \end{aligned}$$

The vectors A and B are real, and hence we can choose the complex matrix Φ so that $A + (\operatorname{Re} \Phi)B = 0$. This leaves us with

$$\|(\operatorname{Im} \Phi)B\|^2 < \alpha \min \operatorname{Spec}(\operatorname{Im} \Phi),$$

which can be arranged by making $\operatorname{Im} \Phi$ sufficiently small*.

From (2.11) we see that $\Lambda \subset \{p = 0\}$ is locally a graph, and since it is Lagrangian, a graph of a differential of a phase function ϕ . Since the tangent plane is positive (2.11) shows that the Hessian of that phase function has a positive definite imaginary part:

$$\Lambda = \{(z, d_z \phi(z))\}, \quad p(z, d_z \phi) = 0, \quad \phi(x^0) = 0, \quad d_z \phi(x^0) = \xi^0, \quad \operatorname{Im} d_z^2 \phi(x^0) \gg 0.$$

[‡]These tangent spaces, $T_{\rho} \Lambda_0$, are complex linear subspaces of $T_{\rho} \mathbb{C}^n$.

*An alternative, and slicker, way of proceeding is by first observing that the positivity is invariant under affine linear canonical transformations. Using that, and a multiplication by a non-vanishing factor, we can assume that $p = \xi_n - ix_n + \mathcal{O}((x, \xi)^2)$ and that $(x^0, \xi^0) = (0, 0)$. It is then straightforward to find $\phi(x)$ with the desired properties.

We also note that $\Lambda \cap T^*\mathbb{R}^n = \{(x^0, \xi^0)\}$ which corresponds to the fact that $\text{Im } d_z \phi \neq 0$ for $z \neq x^0$.

Once the phase function has been constructed we apply the usual WKB construction:

$$v(z, h) \sim e^{i\phi(z)/h} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j(z) h^j,$$

where we will want the coefficients, a_j 's to be holomorphic near $z = x^0$, and to satisfy bounds $|a_j(z)| \leq C^j j^j$. They are constructed so that

$$\left(\sum_{j < 1/Ch} p_j^w(z, hD_z) h^j \right) \left(e^{i\phi(z)/h} \sum_{j < 1/Ch} a_j(z) h^j \right) = \mathcal{O}(e^{-1/Ch}).$$

Here p^w denotes the Weyl quantization of a holomorphic symbol $p(z, \zeta)$ acting on holomorphic functions (compare to (2.1)):

$$p^w(z, hD_z)u = \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n} \iint_{\Gamma_z} p\left(\frac{z+w}{2}, \zeta\right) e^{\frac{i}{h}\langle z-w, \zeta \rangle} u(w) dw d\zeta,$$

where the contour Γ_z is suitably chosen – see [20, Section 4] for a discussion of the general case.

The transport equations for a_j 's then are:

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \partial_{\zeta_k} p_0(z, d_z \phi(z)) \partial_{z_k} a_j(z) + i p_1(z, d_z \phi(z)) a_j = A_j(z),$$

where $A_j(z)$ depends on a_l 's with $l < j$, and we put $a_0(x_1^0, y) = 1$. It is now classical that the solutions satisfy $|a_j| \leq C^j j^j$ near x^0 – see [20, Theorem 9.3]. The real quasi-mode is obtained by restricting to the real axis and by truncating $v(z, h)$:

$$u(x, h) = \chi(x) v(x, h), \quad \chi(x) = 1, \quad |x - x^0| < \delta, \quad \text{supp } \chi \subset \mathbb{B}(x^0, 2\delta)$$

where δ is small. Since the construction has shown that $\text{Im } \phi \geq |x - x^0|^2/C$, the cut-off function χ does not destroy the exponential smallness of the error. $\square$

For completeness, and later use in §6, we include a result on the discreteness of the spectrum.

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose that $p \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let Ω be an open connected (h -independent) set, satisfying*

$$\overline{\Omega} \cap \Sigma_\infty(p) = \emptyset, \quad \Omega \cap \mathbb{C}\Sigma(p) \neq \emptyset.$$

Then $(p^w(x, hD) - z)^{-1}$, $0 < h < h_0(\Omega)$, $z \in \Omega$, is a meromorphic family of operators with poles of finite rank.

In particular, for h sufficiently small, the spectrum of $p^w(x, hD)$ is discrete in any such set.

Proof. If Ω satisfies the assumptions of the proposition then there exists $C > 0$ such that for every $z \in \Omega$, we have $|p(x, \xi) - z| > 1/C$ if $|(x, \xi)| > C$. The assumption that $\Omega \cap \mathbb{C}\Sigma(p) \neq \emptyset$ implies that for some $z_0 \in \Omega$, $(p(x, \xi) - z_0)^{-1} \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let $\chi \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^n; [0, 1])$ be equal to 1 in a sufficiently large bounded domain. The remarks above show that

$$r(x, \xi; z) = \chi(x, \xi)(z_0 - p(x, \xi))^{-1} + (1 - \chi(x, \xi))(z - p(x, \xi))^{-1},$$

is in $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^n)$. The symbol calculus reviewed in §2 then gives

$$\begin{aligned} r^w(x, hD, z)(z - p^w(x, hD)) &= I + \mathcal{O}_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2}(h) + K_1(z), \\ (z - p^w(x, hD))r^w(x, hD, z) &= I + \mathcal{O}_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2}(h) + K_2(z), \end{aligned}$$

where $K_j(z)$, $j = 1, 2$ are compact operators on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, depending holomorphically on z and vanishing for $z = z_0$.

By the analytic Fredholm theory we conclude that $(z - p^w(x, hD))^{-1}$ is meromorphic in Ω for h sufficiently small. $\square$

Remark. The same result holds for $P(h)$ of the form considered in §2 with $p_j \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^n)$: the lower order terms do not affect the meromorphy when h is small. We also comment on the case presented in §1.

Suppose that $m(x, \xi)$ is an admissible weight function, that is a positive function on $T^*\mathbb{R}^n \simeq \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ satisfying

$$\forall X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} \quad 1 \leq m(X) \leq C \langle X - Y \rangle^N m(Y),$$

for some fixed C and N . Following [5] for symbols satisfying $|\partial_X^\alpha p(X)| \leq C_\alpha m(X)$ we can define operator $P = p^w(x, hD)$. In the analytic case we require that

$$|p(X)| \leq m(\operatorname{Re} X), \quad |\operatorname{Im} X| \leq 1/C.$$

In the example given in §1 we can take $m(x, \xi) = \langle \xi \rangle^2 + \langle x \rangle^m$.

Under an ellipticity assumption

$$|p(X)| \geq m(\operatorname{Re} X)/C, \quad |X| \geq C, \quad |\operatorname{Im} X| \leq 1/C,$$

we obtain an invertibility: if $z_1 \notin \overline{p(\mathbb{R}^{2n})}$ then $P - z_1$ is invertible. If we define the operator

$$Q = (P - z_1)^{-1}(P - z_3), \quad z_3 \neq z_1,$$

then the resolvents of Q and P are related by

$$(Q - \zeta)^{-1} = (1 - \zeta)^{-1}(P - z_1) \left(P - \frac{\zeta z_1 - z_3}{\zeta - 1} \right)^{-1},$$

so that the reduction of Schrödinger operators to the case of operators with bounded symbols was justified.

4. DECREASE OF PSEUDO-SPECTRUM BY A CHANGE OF NORMS

In this section we will prove Theorem 3. That will be done by using a dynamically defined function G which grows on the bicharacteristics of $\operatorname{Re} p$.

In the analytic case we will now use the microlocally weighted spaces, $H(\Lambda_{tG})$, the construction of which was recalled in §2, to decrease the pseudo-spectrum by changing the norm on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in an h -dependent way. In particular this will show that under assumptions (1.4), (1.5), and (1.6), the spectrum is separated from the boundary of the pseudo-spectrum.

4.1. Construction of microlocal weights. We start with

Lemma 4.1. *If (1.4) and (1.5) hold, then for $q = ie^{-i\theta_0}(p - z_0)$ and $\rho_0 \in T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ with $q(\rho_0) = 0$, we have*

$$(4.1) \quad \operatorname{Im} q \leq 0 \quad \text{on} \quad (\operatorname{Re} q)^{-1}(0) \cap \operatorname{neigh}(\rho_0, \mathbb{R}^{2n}).$$

Furthermore, $d \operatorname{Re} q(\rho_0) \neq 0$ and $d \operatorname{Im} q(\rho_0) = \lambda_0 d \operatorname{Re} q(\rho_0)$ for some $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$.

Notation. From now on we will assume, without loss of generality, that $p = q$, and $z_0 = 0$. We recall the conditions (1.5) and (1.6):

$$(4.2) \quad \exists \epsilon_0 > 0 \text{ such that } (0, \epsilon_0)ie^{i(-\epsilon_0, \epsilon_0)} \cap \Lambda(p) = \emptyset,$$

$$(4.3) \quad \text{No trajectory of } H_{\operatorname{Re} p} \text{ can remain in } p^{-1}(0) \text{ for an unbounded period of time.}$$

Proof. We first recall that $dp(\rho_0) \neq 0$ by (1.4). If this differential were purely imaginary, it is easy to see that we get a contradiction with (4.2). Hence $d\operatorname{Re} p(\rho_0) \neq 0$. Using (4.2) again it is clear that $q \leq 0$ on $\operatorname{Re} q^{-1}(0)$, near ρ_0 , and that $d\operatorname{Im} p(\rho_0)$ cannot be independent of $d\operatorname{Re} p(\rho_0)$. $\square$

The next lemma gives a construction of the weight:

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that (1.4), (4.3) hold. Then there exists $G \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n}; \mathbb{R})$, such that $H_{\operatorname{Re} p} G(\rho) > 0$ for every $\rho \in p^{-1}(0)$.*

Proof. The assumption (4.3), gives a seemingly stronger statement:

$$(4.4) \quad \exists T_0 > 0 \quad \forall (x, \xi) \in (\operatorname{Re} q)^{-1}(0) \quad \exists 0 < t < T_0 \quad \text{such that} \quad (\operatorname{Im} q)(\exp(tH_{\operatorname{Re} q})((x, \xi))) \neq 0,$$

and it allows us a construction of a global weight G . Indeed, we first construct G locally: Let $\gamma(t)$, $0 \leq t \leq T_1$ ($0 \leq T_1 < T_0$) be a maximal $H_{\operatorname{Re} p}$ integral curve in $p^{-1}(0)$. Then we can find a real-valued $G \in C_0^\infty$ with support in a small neighbourhood of the image of γ such that $H_{\operatorname{Re} p} G \geq 0$ on $p^{-1}(0)$ with strict inequality on the image of γ . We then get the G of the lemma, by taking a finite sum of such local G 's. $\square$

4.2. The C^∞ case. Let

$$(4.5) \quad C_1 h \leq \epsilon \leq C_2 h \log \frac{1}{h},$$

where $C_1 > 0$ is large enough. We shall derive an estimate for the equation

$$P_\epsilon(h)u = v,$$

when $\operatorname{WF}_h(u)$ is contained in a small neighborhood of $p^{-1}(0)$, and where

$$P_\epsilon(h) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e^{\epsilon G/h} P(h) e^{-\epsilon G/h} = e^{\frac{\epsilon}{h} \operatorname{ad}_G} P(h) \sim \sum_0^\infty \frac{\epsilon^k}{k!} \left(\frac{1}{h} \operatorname{ad}_G \right)^k (P(h)), \quad G = G^w(x, hD).$$

We note that the assumption on ϵ and the boundedness of ad_G/h show that the expansion makes sense. The operators $\exp(\epsilon G/h)$ are pseudo-differential in an exotic class $S_\delta^{C^2}$ for any $\delta > 0$ (see [5]) but that is not relevant here. We are essentially using the method of pseudodifferential operators of variable order [28]. In a related context of the absence of resonances similar methods where recently used in [18].

Dropping h in $P(h)$ and using the same letters for operators and the corresponding symbols, we see that

$$P_\epsilon = P + i\epsilon\{p, G\} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) = p + i\epsilon\{p, G\} + \mathcal{O}(h + \epsilon^2),$$

so that

$$\operatorname{Re} P_\epsilon = \operatorname{Re} p - \epsilon\{\operatorname{Im} p, G\} + \mathcal{O}(h + \epsilon^2),$$

$$\operatorname{Im} P_\epsilon = \operatorname{Im} p + \epsilon\{\operatorname{Re} p, G\} + \mathcal{O}(h + \epsilon^2).$$

The positivity assumption implies that

$$(4.6) \quad \operatorname{Im} p + \lambda(x, \xi) \operatorname{Re} p \geq 0,$$

for a suitable smooth and real-valued function λ . Let us consider

$$(4.7) \quad \operatorname{Im} P_\epsilon + \lambda \operatorname{Re} P_\epsilon = \operatorname{Im} p + \lambda(x, \xi) \operatorname{Re} p + \epsilon\{\operatorname{Re} p - \lambda \operatorname{Im} p, G\} + \mathcal{O}(h + \epsilon^2),$$

and let us write (4.6) as $\operatorname{Im} p = -\lambda \operatorname{Re} p + r$, where $r \geq 0$ vanishes on $p^{-1}(0)$, so that ∇r also vanishes there. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \{\operatorname{Re} p - \lambda \operatorname{Im} p, G\} &= \{(1 + \lambda^2) \operatorname{Re} p, G\} - \{\lambda r, G\} = \\ &= (1 + \lambda^2)\{\operatorname{Re} p, G\} + \{\lambda^2, G\} \operatorname{Re} p - \{\lambda r, G\} \geq 1/C, \end{aligned}$$

since $\operatorname{Re} p$, $\{\lambda r, G\}$ are small near $p^{-1}(0)$.

Using this and (4.6) in (4.7), we get

$$(4.8) \quad \operatorname{Im} P_\epsilon + \lambda \operatorname{Re} P_\epsilon \geq \frac{\epsilon}{C} + \mathcal{O}(h + \epsilon^2).$$

Consider

$$J = \left(\frac{1}{2i}(P_\epsilon - P_\epsilon^*)u|u\right) + \left(\frac{1}{2}(\lambda P_\epsilon + P_\epsilon^* \lambda)u|u\right).$$

On the one hand,

$$J = \operatorname{Im}(P_\epsilon u|u) + \operatorname{Re}(\lambda P_\epsilon u|u),$$

so

$$(4.9) \quad |J| \leq C \|P_\epsilon u\| \|u\|.$$

On the other hand, the symbol of

$$\frac{1}{2i}(P_\epsilon - P_\epsilon^*) + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda P_\epsilon + P_\epsilon^* \lambda)$$

is equal to $\mathcal{O}(h)$ plus the expression (4.8), so (4.8) and the sharp Gårding inequality (see [5, Theorem 7.12] or apply (2.8) with $G = 0$ and $p_1 = \operatorname{Im} P_\epsilon + \lambda \operatorname{Re} P_\epsilon$, $p_2 = 1$) imply

$$J \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2C} \|u\|^2.$$

Combining this with (4.9), we get

$$\|u\| \leq \frac{2C^2}{\epsilon} \|P_\epsilon u\|$$

and in view of (4.5), where $C_2 > 0$ can be arbitrarily large, we conclude that for every $C > 0$, we have

$$D(0, Ch \log \frac{1}{h}) \cap \sigma(P) = \emptyset, \quad 0 < h < h(C),$$

when $h(C) > 0$ is sufficiently small.

4.3. The analytic case. To apply the theory of weighted spaces reviewed in §2 we need one more

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose that (1.4), (4.2), and (4.3) hold, and that G is given by Lemma 4.2. In the notation of (2.7) we have, for sufficiently small $t > 0$,*

$$(4.10) \quad |p|_{\Lambda_{tG}}| > t/C.$$

Proof. The proof of Lemma 4.1 shows that if ρ_0 is a point with $p(\rho_0) = 0$ and we define λ_0 , by $d \operatorname{Im} p(\rho_0) = \lambda_0 d \operatorname{Re} p(\rho_0)$, then for every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a neighbourhood W of ρ_0 , such that if $\rho \in W$, then

$$(4.11) \quad \operatorname{Im} p(\rho) \leq \lambda_0 \operatorname{Re} p(\rho) + \epsilon |\operatorname{Re} p(\rho)|.$$

Now,

$$p(\rho + itH_G) = p(\rho) - itH_p G(\rho) + \mathcal{O}(t^2) = p(\rho) - itH_{\operatorname{Re} p} G + tH_{\operatorname{Im} p} G + \mathcal{O}(t^2).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\operatorname{Im} p - \lambda_0 \operatorname{Re} p)(\rho + itH_G(\rho)) \\ &= (\operatorname{Im} p - \lambda_0 \operatorname{Re} p)(\rho) - tH_{\operatorname{Re} p} G(\rho) - \lambda_0 tH_{\operatorname{Im} p} G(\rho) + \mathcal{O}(t^2) \\ &= (\operatorname{Im} p - \lambda_0 \operatorname{Re} p)(\rho) - (1 + \lambda_0^2)tH_{\operatorname{Re} p} G(\rho_0) + \mathcal{O}(t|\rho - \rho_0|) + \mathcal{O}(t^2). \end{aligned}$$

Since $H_{\text{Re } p} G(\rho_0) > 0$, for $|\rho - \rho_0|$ small enough,

$$(4.12) \quad (\text{Im } p - \lambda_0 \text{Re } p - \epsilon |\text{Re } p|)(\rho + itH_G(\rho)) \leq -\frac{1}{C}t + \mathcal{O}(t|\rho - \rho_0|) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon t) \leq -\frac{1}{2C}t,$$

where we also used (4.11). $\square$

As a consequence of the last lemma we see that 0 is a removable point of the pseudospectrum. To see this we recall that $H(\Lambda_{tG})$ is equal to L^2 as a space and that the norms are equivalent for every fixed h (but not uniformly with respect to h). The spectrum of $P(h)$ therefore does not depend on whether we realize this operator on L^2 or on $H(\Lambda_{tG})$. We conclude that 0 has an h -independent neighbourhood which is disjoint from the spectrum of $P(h)$, when h is small enough. All this is summarized in the following result which is an immediate consequence of Lemma 4.3 and (2.9):

Theorem 3'. *Suppose that $z_0 \in \partial\Lambda(p) \setminus \Sigma_\infty(p)$ and that (1.4), (1.5), and (1.6) hold. In the notation of Lemma 4.2 let us introduce the IR-manifold $\Lambda_{tG} = \{\rho + itH_G(\rho); \rho \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}\}$ for $t > 0$ small enough. If*

$$P(h) \sim \sum_j h^j p_j^2(x, hD), \quad p_0 = p, \quad p_j \text{'s satisfy the assumptions of §2,}$$

then

$$P(h) - z_0 : H(\Lambda_{tG}) \longrightarrow H(\Lambda_{tG}),$$

has a bounded inverse for h small enough. In particular, for δ small enough but independent of h ,

$$\sigma(P(h)) \cap D(z_0, \delta) = \emptyset, \quad 0 < h < h_0.$$

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 4

We first observe that that property of being of finite type and the order of the symbol is invariant under multiplication with elliptic factors. In fact, if $0 \neq q \in C^\infty$ then the repeated Poisson brackets of $\text{Re } qp$ and $\text{Im } qp$ of order $\leq j$ is a linear combination with smooth coefficients of those of p_1 and p_2 and vice versa (see Section 27.2 in [14]).

Since we rely heavily on the localization argument based on Weyl calculus of pseudodifferential operators we will follow [14, Section 18.5] and introduce

$$(5.1) \quad g_h(dx, d\xi) = |dx|^2 + h^2 |d\xi|^2.$$

We then find that $p(x, h\xi) \in S(1, g_h)$. We will also introduce the notion of *local pseudo-spectrum* defined as follows:

$$\Lambda(p(\Omega)) = \overline{p(\Omega \cap \{\{p, \bar{p}\} \neq 0\})}.$$

5.1. Reduction to normal form. Assume that $z_0 \in \partial\Lambda(p)$ is a principal value that is, (1.4) holds. By subtracting z_0 we may assume that $z_0 = 0$. Let $w_0 = (x_0, \xi_0) \in p^{-1}(0)$, then since $|dp(w_0)| \neq 0$ we may assume that $\partial_x p = 0$ and $\partial_{\xi_j} p = 0$, $j > 1$, at w_0 by a symplectic change of coordinates. By using the Malgrange Preparation Theorem, we obtain

$$(5.2) \quad p = q(\xi_1 + if(x, \xi')) = q\tilde{p} \quad \xi = (\xi_1, \xi')$$

in a neighborhood Ω of w_0 . Here $0 \neq q \in C^\infty$ and $f(x, \xi') \in C^\infty$ is real valued. In the following, we put $B_r = \{w \in T^*\mathbb{R}^n : |w - w_0| \leq r\}$ for $r > 0$.

Lemma 5.1. *We have that $0 \in \partial\Lambda(p(B_r))$ for sufficiently small $r > 0$ if and only if $\pm f \geq 0$ on B_r for a choice of sign, which implies that $\tilde{p}$ and p satisfy condition (P) on B_r .*

Thus the property of a principal value being a boundary value is preserved under multiplication with elliptic factors.

Proof. We find that $\pm f \geq 0$ in B_r if and only if $\pm \arg[\tilde{p}(B_r) \setminus 0] \subseteq [0, \pi]$ (otherwise it is $[-\pi, \pi]$). Since $q(w)/q(w_0) \rightarrow 1$ for $w \in B_r$ when $r \rightarrow 0$, we find that $|\arg(q(w)/q(w_0))| < \pi/2$ when $w \in B_r$ for small enough r . We find that $\pm f \geq 0$ in B_r if and only if $p(B_r) \setminus 0 = q\tilde{p}(B_r) \setminus 0$ is contained in a sector $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \arg z \notin [a, b]\}$ where $a \neq b$, and thus $0 \in \partial\Lambda(p(B_r))$ for small enough r . In fact, if $f \geq 0$ in B_r for some $r > 0$ then it is easy to find a piecewise linear closed curve γ_r in B_r such that $\tilde{p}(\gamma_r)$ (and thus $p(\gamma_r)$) has winding number equal to one in $\mathbb{C}$. If Π is a piecewise linear surface containing γ_ϱ then p maps the bounded component of $\Pi \setminus \gamma_\varrho$ onto a neighborhood of the origin, since $p(w_0) = 0$. $\square$

We note that the lemma implies that (1.5) holds locally.

Proof of Theorem 4. As before, we may obtain p of the form (5.2) near $w_0 = (x_0, \xi_0) \in p^{-1}(0)$ after subtracting a constant. Since $0 \in \partial\Lambda(p)$ we find from Lemma 5.1 that $f \geq 0$ after possibly switching x_1 to $-x_1$ and multiplying with -1 . By the invariance we find that $\tilde{p}_I(w_0) \neq 0$ for some I such that $|I| = k + 1$ where k is the order of p at w_0 , which is less or equal to the order of $z_0 = 0$. Since $f \geq 0$ we find that $H_f = 0$ when $f = 0$. Thus, the only non-vanishing repeated Poisson bracket of order $k + 1$ at w_0 is equal to $\partial_{x_1}^k f(0, \xi'_0)$, $\xi_0 = (0, \xi'_0)$, and since $f \geq 0$ we find that $k = 2l$ is even and

$$(5.3) \quad \partial_{x_1}^{2l} f(0, \xi'_0) > 0$$

see [14, Propositions 27.2.1, 27.2.2, and (27.3.1)]. It can be seen from the (highly non-obvious) equivalent characterization (1.9).

By choosing a suitable cut-off function $\psi(x', \xi') \in C_0^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^{n-1})$ supported near $(0, \xi'_0)$ such that $0 \leq \psi(x', \xi') \leq 1$ and replacing $f(x, \xi')$ by $\psi(x', \xi')f(x, \xi') + x_1^k(1 - \psi(x', \xi'))$ we may assume that $f \in C^\infty$ is uniformly bounded and

$$(5.4) \quad \partial_{x_1}^k f(x, \xi') > 0 \quad \text{when } |x_1| \leq c.$$

By a change of variables we may assume that $c = 1$.

Since $p^{-1}(0)$ is compact, we may take $0 \leq \phi_j \in C_0^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^n)$, $j = 1, \dots, N$, and $\phi_0 = 1 - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N} \phi_j$, such that p is on the form (5.2) with f satisfying (5.4) in $\text{supp } \phi_j$, $j > 0$, and $|p| \geq c_0 > 0$ on $\text{supp } \phi_0$. Then we obtain that

$$\|\phi_0^w(x, hD_x)u\| \leq C(\|p^w(x, hD_x)u\| + h\|u\|)$$

by using that $p^{-1}(x, h\xi) \in S(1, g_h)$ on $\text{supp } \phi_0$. We find from Proposition 5.2 and (5.4) that

$$\|\phi_j^w(x, hD_x)u\| \leq Ch^{-\frac{k}{k+1}}(\|p^w(x, hD_x)u\| + h\|u\|) \quad j > 0$$

since we may assume that $c = 1$ in (5.4), and

$$(5.5) \quad \tilde{p}^w(x, hD_x)\phi_j^w(x, hD_x) \cong \phi_j^w(x, hD_x)(q^{-1})^w(x, hD_x)p^w(x, hD_x)$$

modulo $\text{Op } S(h, g_h)$. This gives

$$\|u\| \leq \sum_{j=0}^N \|\phi_j^w(x, hD_x)u\| \leq C_0 h^{-\frac{k}{k+1}}(\|p^w(x, hD_x)u\| + h\|u\|).$$

For small enough $h > 0$ we find that

$$(5.6) \quad \|u\| \leq C_0 h^{-\frac{k}{k+1}} \|p^w(x, hD_x)u\|$$

which proves Theorem 4. $\square$

The estimates for the localized operators will be proved in the next subsection.

5.2. The Model Operator. In this section we shall consider the following subelliptic model operator

$$(5.7) \quad P(h) = hD_t + if^w(t, x, hD_x) \quad 0 \leq f \in C^\infty \quad 0 < h \leq 1$$

which we assume satisfies (5.4). In this subsection we rely heavily on [14, Section 27.3].

Proposition 5.2. *Assume $P(h)$ is given by (5.7), where $f \in C^\infty$ is uniformly bounded and satisfies*

$$(5.8) \quad \max_{j \leq k} |\partial_t^j f(t, x, \xi)| \neq 0$$

for $|t| \leq 1$. Then we obtain

$$(5.9) \quad \|u\| \leq Ch^{-\frac{k}{k+1}} \|P(h)u\|$$

for $u \in C_0^\infty$ having support when $|t| \leq 1$.

Proof. By the non-negativity of $f \in C^\infty$ we obtain from [13, Lemma 7.7.2] that

$$(5.10) \quad |\partial_x f|^2 + |\partial_\xi f|^2 \leq Cf \quad |t| \leq 1.$$

In the following, we shall assume that $|t| \leq 1$.

Next, we write $P(h) = hP_h$ where

$$(5.11) \quad P_h = D_t + ih^{-1}f^w(t, x, hD_x) = D_t + iF_h^w(t, x, D_x)$$

with $F_h(t, x, \xi) = h^{-1}f(t, x, h\xi) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, S(h^{-1}, g_h))$. We obtain from (5.8) that

$$(5.12) \quad \max_{0 \leq j \leq k} |\partial_t^j F_h| \geq ch^{-\frac{1}{k+1}}$$

since $h^{-\frac{1}{j+1}} \geq h^{-\frac{1}{k+1}}$ when $0 \leq j \leq k$ and $0 < h \leq 1$.

Now we let $F_{h,w}(t) = F_h(t, w)$ for $w = (x, \xi)$. By Lemma 27.3.4 in [14] we obtain

$$(5.13) \quad h^{-\frac{1}{k+1}} \|u\| + \|F_{h,w}(t)u\| \leq C \|(D_t + iF_{h,w}(t))u\| \quad \forall w$$

for small enough $h > 0$ and $u \in C_0^\infty$ having support where $|t| \leq 1$. In fact,

$$M_1(t) = \max_{j \leq k} |\partial_t^j F_{h,w}(t)| \geq \max(|F_{h,w}(t)|, ch^{-\frac{1}{k+1}}) \gg 1$$

when $0 < h \ll 1$ and $|t| \leq 1$.

Next we shall introduce a new symbol class adapted to F_h . By (5.10) we obtain that

$$(5.14) \quad h|\partial_x F_h|^2 + h^{-1}|\partial_\xi F_h|^2 \leq C|F_h|,$$

which means that

$$(5.15) \quad |F_h|_1^{g_h} \leq C_1 \sqrt{F_h} h^{-1/2}.$$

Let

$$(5.16) \quad m(t, w) = F_h(t, w) + h^{-1/k+1} \geq 1$$

and $g_{m(t,w)} = g_h/hm(t, w)$, with g_h given by (5.1). Then it follows from (5.15) that g_m is σ temperate, $g_m/g_m^\sigma = m^{-2} \leq 1$ and that m is a weight for g_m . In fact,

$$|F_h(t, w) - F_h(t, w_0)| \leq C \varrho m(t, w_0) \quad \text{when } g_{m(t,w_0)}(w - w_0) \leq \varrho^2,$$

since then $g_h(w - w_0) \leq \varrho^2 hm(t, w_0)$. This gives the slow variation, and since

$$g_{m(t,w_1)}^\sigma(w_1 - w_0) = m(t, w_1)g_h(w_1 - w_0)/h \geq cm(t, w_0)$$

when $g_m(t, w_0)(w_1 - w_0) \geq c$, we obtain that g_m is σ temperate. It also follows from (5.15) that $F_h \in S(m, g_m)$, since $|F_h|_1^{g_m} = \sqrt{m}h^{1/2}|F_h|_1^{g_h}$ and

$$|F_h|_j^{g_m} \leq C_j(mh)^{j/2}|F_h|_j^{g_h} \leq C_j m, \quad j \geq 2.$$

Next, we shall localize the estimate. Take a partition of unity $\{\phi_j(w)\} \in S(1, g_\varepsilon)$, where $g_\varepsilon = h^{2\varepsilon-1}g_h$ and $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2k+2} < \frac{1}{2}$ is fixed. This can be done uniformly in h , and in the following all estimates are uniform in h . Observe that since $2\varepsilon < \frac{1}{k+1}$ we find $g_m \leq g_\varepsilon$ for any t . We assume that ϕ_j is supported in a sufficiently small g_ε neighborhood of w_j , so that $m(t, w) \cong m(t, w_j)$ only varies with a fixed factor in $\text{supp } \phi_j$ for any t . Since $\sum \phi_j^2 = 1$ and $g_\varepsilon = h^{4\varepsilon}g_\varepsilon^\sigma$ the calculus gives

$$(5.17) \quad \sum_j \|\phi_j^w(x, D_x)u\|^2 - Ch^{4\varepsilon}\|u\|^2 \leq \|u\|^2 \leq \sum_j \|\phi_j^w(x, D_x)u\|^2 + Ch^{4\varepsilon}\|u\|^2$$

for $u \in C_0^\infty$, thus for small enough h we find

$$(5.18) \quad \sum_j \|\phi_j^w(x, D_x)u\|^2 \leq 2\|u\|^2 \leq 4 \sum_j \|\phi_j^w(x, D_x)u\|^2 \quad \text{for } u \in C_0^\infty.$$

We find from (5.13) for small enough h that

$$(5.19) \quad h^{-\frac{1}{k+1}} \|\phi_j^w(x, D_x)u\| + \|F_{h, w_j}(t)\phi_j^w(x, D_x)u\| \leq C \|\phi_j^w(x, D_x)(D_t + iF_{h, w_j}(t))u\| \quad \forall j$$

and the calculus gives

$$(5.20) \quad \phi_j^w(x, D_x) (F_h^w(t, x, D_x) - F_{0, w_j}(t)) = R_j^w(t, x, D_x) \in S(m^{1/2}h^{-\varepsilon}, g_\varepsilon)$$

since

$$|F_h(t, w) - F_{h, w_j}(t)| \leq C\sqrt{m}h^{-\varepsilon} \text{ in } \text{supp } \phi_j$$

by (5.15). In fact, we find that $|F_h|_1^{g_\varepsilon} = h^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}|F_h|_1^{g_h} \leq Cm^{1/2}h^{-\varepsilon}$, and for $k \geq 2$ we have

$$|F_h|_k^{g_\varepsilon} = h^{k(\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon)}|F_h|_k^{g_h} \leq C_k h^{\frac{k-2}{2}-k\varepsilon} \leq C_k h^{-2\varepsilon} \leq C_k \sqrt{m}h^{-\varepsilon}$$

since $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2k+2} < \frac{1}{2}$.

We obtain from (5.18) that

$$(5.21) \quad \|F_h^w(t, x, D_x)u\|^2 \leq 4 \sum_j \|F_{h, w_j}(t)\phi_j^w(x, D_x)u\|^2 + 4\langle R^w(t, x, D_x)u, u \rangle \quad u \in C_0^\infty$$

where $R^w(t, x, D_x) = \sum_j \overline{R}_j^w(t, x, D_x)R_j^w(t, x, D_x) \in \text{Op } S(mh^{-2\varepsilon}, g_\varepsilon)$. Since

$$m = F_h + h^{-1/k+1} > 0,$$

we obtain that $m^{-1} \in S(m^{-1}, g_m)$. In fact, the Leibniz' rule gives

$$|m^{-1}|_k^{g_m} \leq C_k \sum_{r_1+\dots+r_j=k} m^{-1-j} \prod_{i=1}^j |m|_{r_i}^{g_m} \leq C'_k m^{-1}.$$

Thus we obtain that

$$(5.22) \quad (m^{-1})^w(t, x, D_x)m^w(t, x, D_x) \cong 1$$

modulo $\text{Op } S(m^{-2}, g_m) \subseteq \text{Op } S(h^{4\varepsilon}, g_\varepsilon)$, since $m^{-2} \leq h^{4\varepsilon}$. This gives

$$\|R^w u\| \leq C(h^{-2\varepsilon}\|(F_h + h^{-1/k+1})^w u\| + h^{4\varepsilon}\|R^w u\|)$$

since $h^{2\varepsilon} R^w(m^{-1})^w \in \text{Op} S(1, g_\varepsilon)$. We obtain by Cauchy-Schwarz that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle R^w u, u \rangle| &\leq C h^{-2\varepsilon} \|(F_h^w + h^{-1/k+1})u\| \|u\| \\ &\leq \varrho (\|F_h^w u\|^2 + h^{-\frac{2}{k+1}} \|u\|^2) + C_\varrho h^{-4\varepsilon} \|u\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

for $u \in C_0^\infty$. We also find that there exists $H_\varrho > 0$ so that

$$(5.23) \quad C_\varrho h^{-4\varepsilon} \|u\|^2 \leq \varrho h^{-\frac{2}{k+1}} \|u\|^2 \quad \text{when } 0 < h \leq H_\varrho$$

which implies that

$$(5.24) \quad |\langle R^w u, u \rangle| \leq 2\varrho \left(\|F_h^w u\|^2 + h^{-\frac{2}{k+1}} \|u\|^2 \right)$$

for $u \in C_0^\infty$ and small $h > 0$. By (5.18) and (5.20) we find

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_j \|\phi_j^w(x, D_x)(D_t + iF_{h,w_j}(t))u\|^2 &\leq \\ 4\|(D_t + iF_h(t))u\|^2 + 8\varrho \left(\|F_h^w u\|^2 + h^{-\frac{2}{k+1}} \|u\|^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

for $u \in C_0^\infty$ and small enough $h > 0$. We obtain from (5.18) and (5.19) that

$$\begin{aligned} h^{-\frac{2}{k+1}} \|u\|^2 + \|F_h^w u\|^2 &\leq \\ 16C^2 \|(D_t + iF_h^w)u\|^2 + 8\varrho(4C^2 + 1) \left(\|F_h^w u\|^2 + h^{-\frac{2}{k+1}} \|u\|^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

for $u \in C_0^\infty$ and small $h > 0$. Thus for small enough ϱ and h we obtain the estimate

$$h^{-\frac{2}{k+1}} \|u\|^2 \leq 32C^2 \|(D_t + iF_h^w)u\|^2 = 32C^2 \|P_h u\|^2 \quad u \in C_0^\infty.$$

Since $P(h) = hP_h$ we obtain (5.9), which completes the proof of the Proposition. $\square$

6. DISSIPATIVE OPERATORS WITHOUT THE DYNAMICAL CONDITION

The failure of (1.6) and the consequent failure of Theorem 3 are illustrated by the following variant of Davies's example [2] in dimension two:

$$p(x, \xi) = \xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2 + x_1^2 - ix_2^2.$$

The spectrum of $p^w(x, hD)$ is given by $\{(2n+1)h\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \cup \{e^{\pi i/4}(2k+1)h\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, and $\Lambda(p)$ is the first quadrant. We see that (1.5) is satisfied everywhere at the boundary, (1.4) everywhere except for $z_0 = 0$. The dynamical condition (1.6) is satisfied on the imaginary half-axis but fails on the real half-axis.

In this section we present a general result in the same spirit. Suppose that $P(h)$ satisfies the general assumptions of §2, but does not need to have an analytic symbol. In addition we assume that

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{aligned} P(h) &= Q(h) - iW(h) \\ Q(h) &= Q(h)^*, \quad W(h) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

In the classical terminology of [8] this means that our non-self-adjoint operator is dissipative. One way of achieving this semi-classically is by putting

$$\begin{aligned} Q(h) &= q^w(x, hD), \quad q \text{ real valued}, \quad W(h) = a^W(x, hD), \quad \text{with } a \geq 0, \\ a^W(x, hD) &= \iint a(y, \eta) \Gamma_{y, \eta}^w(x, hD) dy d\eta, \quad \Gamma_{y, \eta}(x, \xi) = \frac{1}{\pi^n} e^{-|x-y|^2 - |\xi-\eta|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\bullet^w$ stands for the Weyl quantization (2.1), and $\bullet^W$ for the Wick quantization.

This assumption immediately implies that $\Lambda(p) \subset \{\operatorname{Im} z \leq 0\}$, and also that

$$z \in \sigma(P(h)) \implies \operatorname{Im} z \leq 0,$$

In fact we have

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} -\operatorname{Im}\langle (P(h) - z)u, u \rangle &\geq \operatorname{Im} z \|u\|^2 \\ (P(h) - z)^{-1} &= \mathcal{O}(1/\operatorname{Im} z), \quad \operatorname{Im} z > 0. \end{aligned}$$

We can now use techniques common in the study of dissipative operators – see [8],[16],[10], and references given there. Similar techniques have been also developed in the study of semi-classical resonances [21],[24],[23],[25] and our approach follows these works in an easier setting of dissipative operators.

Thus we start with

Lemma 6.1. *Assuming (6.1) we have, for any open and precompact subset, Ω , of any component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Sigma_\infty(p)$ intersecting $\mathbb{C}\Sigma(p)$,*

$$(6.3) \quad \|(P(h) - z)^{-1}\| \leq \exp\left(C_\Omega h^{-n} \log \frac{1}{g(h)}\right), \quad z \in \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{z_j \in \sigma(P(h))} D(z_j, g(h)).$$

Proof. We can assume, without loss of generality, that $\Omega = D(z_0, \epsilon)$, and that $D(z_0, 3\epsilon) \cap \Sigma_\infty(p) = \emptyset$. It then follows that for C sufficiently large $p(x, \xi) \notin D(z_0, 2\epsilon)$, and $|(x, \xi)| > C$.

We can then find $p^\# \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} p^\#(x, \xi) &= p(x, \xi) \quad \text{for } |(x, \xi)| > C, \\ \forall z \in \Omega \quad (x, \xi) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^n \quad &|(p^\#(x, \xi) - z)^{-1}| \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

If fact, choose $\alpha : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \setminus D(0, 2\epsilon)$, such that $\alpha(w) = w$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus D(z_0, 3\epsilon)$, and put $p^\# = \alpha \circ p$.

This shows that for h small enough $p^\#(x, hD) - z$ is invertible, $z \in \Omega$.

In view of the compact support of the symbol $p - p^\#$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} p(x, hD) - p^\#(x, hD) &= A + B \\ A : L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n), \\ B = \mathcal{O}(h^\infty) : L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) &\longrightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), \\ p(x, hD) - z &= (p^\#(x, hD) + B - z)(I + (P^\# + B - z)^{-1}A). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $(p^\#(x, hD) - z)^{-1}(p(x, hD) - p^\#(x, hD))$ is a sum of a compact operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and an operator of small norm.

Since the operator $K(z) = (p^\#(x, hD) + B - z)^{-1}A$ is compact we can define

$$g(z) = \det(I + K(z)),$$

which is holomorphic in Ω . The inverse at a point $z_0 \notin \Sigma(p)$, $(I + K(z_0))^{-1}$, exists for h sufficiently small and it is bounded independently of h . We also see that

$$|\det(I + K(z_0))|^{-1} \leq C_1, \quad \text{with } C_1 \text{ independent of } h.$$

As in Proposition 3.3, $(I + K(z))^{-1}$ is meromorphic and, following [8, Ch.5, Theorem 3.1], we see that

$$\|(I + K(z))^{-1}\| \leq \frac{\det(I + (K(z)K(z)^*)^{\frac{1}{2}})}{|\det(I + K(z))|}.$$

Hence we need to estimate the determinants from above and below. The upper bound is clear from $|\det(1 + A)| \leq \exp \operatorname{tr}(AA^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}$: it is given by $\exp \mathcal{O}(h^{-n})$ since

$$\operatorname{tr} \psi(x) b^w(x, hD) \langle hD \rangle^{-m} = \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n} \int \int \psi(x) a(x, \xi) \langle \xi \rangle^{-m} dx d\xi = \mathcal{O}(h^{-n}).$$

The zeros of $\det(I + K(z))$ coincide with the eigenvalues of $P(h)$, and the usual complex analytic methods (see for instance [16, Ch.1], and [21]) show that

$$|\det(I + K(z))|^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{g(h)} \exp(Ch^{-n}), \quad z \in \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{z_j \in \sigma(P(h))} D(z_j, g(h)),$$

which proves the lemma. $\square$

The main result of this section will be an application of Lemma 6.1, (6.2) and of the following simple function theoretical lemma similar to [25, Lemma 2]:

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose that $F(z)$ is holomorphic in $[-\delta, \delta] + i[-\epsilon, \epsilon]$, and $|F(z)| \leq M$, $M \geq 2$, there. Suppose in addition that*

$$|F(z)| \leq \frac{1}{\operatorname{Im} z} \quad \text{for } \operatorname{Im} z > 0, \quad \text{and that} \quad \frac{\epsilon}{\delta} \ll \log M.$$

Then

$$|F(z)| \leq 2 \frac{\log M}{\epsilon}, \quad \text{for } |z| \leq \delta/2 \text{ and } \operatorname{Im} z = 0.$$

Proof. The assumption on δ/ϵ allows us to construct a holomorphic function, $u(z)$, such that $|u(z)| > 2/3$ for $\operatorname{Im} z = 0$, and $|z| < \delta/2$, and $|u(z)| \ll 1/M$ for $|\operatorname{Re} z| = \delta$ and $|\operatorname{Im} z| \leq \epsilon$. If we apply an optimized “three line theorem” argument to $u(z)F(z)$ the lemma follows. $\square$

The two lemmas immediately give

Proposition 6.3. *Suppose that $P(h)$ satisfies (6.1). For $E \in \mathbb{R}$ and $k > 0$ put*

$$\Omega(h) = [E - \delta(h), E + \delta(h)] - i[0, -Kh^n\delta(h)], \quad K \text{ large and fixed.}$$

Then h small enough we have

$$(6.4) \quad \sigma(P(h)) \cap \Omega(h) = \emptyset \implies \|(P(h) - \lambda)^{-1}\| \leq Ch^{-2n}\delta(h)^{-1}, \quad z \in \tilde{\Omega}(h).$$

This means that in small neighbourhoods of the real axis, only eigenvalues can produce extreme growth of the resolvent. A contradiction argument from [23],[24],[25] now shows that existence of quasi-modes for the operator $P(h)$ implies the existence of spectrum arbitrarily close to the real axis, which depending on the structure of $W(h)$, can be the boundary of $\Sigma(P)$.

In particular we have

Proposition 6.4. *Suppose that $P(h)$ satisfies (6.1) and that there exists $u(h) \neq 0$ and $\lambda(h) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$(6.5) \quad \|(P(h) - \lambda(h))u(h)\| = \mathcal{O}(h^N)\|u(h)\|,$$

for some large N . Then for h small enough, and with K sufficiently large

$$d(\sigma(P(h)), \lambda(h)) < Kh^{N-n}.$$

This is clear from (6.4) since applying that resolvent estimate to (6.5) we obtain a contradiction.

In the analytic case we expect that if Imp vanishes to a high order on a closed orbit of H_{Rep} then we can construct a quasi-mode $u(h)$ satisfying (6.5) with a fixed N . If we allow $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ coefficients then constructions of quasi-modes with arbitrarily large N s are possible for operators satisfying the assumptions of this section – see [23],[25] and references given there, and also [30, Fig.1] for a figure of an example.

REFERENCES

- [1] L.S. Boulton, *Non-self-adjoint harmonic oscillator, compact semigroups and pseudospectra*, J. Operator Theory **47**(2002), 413–429.
- [2] E.B. Davies *Pseudo-spectra, the harmonic oscillator and complex resonances*. R. Soc. Lond. Proc. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci. **455**(1999), 585–599.
- [3] E.B. Davies *Semi-classical states for non-self-adjoint Schrödinger operators*. Comm. Math. Phys. **200**(1999), 35–41.
- [4] E.B. Davies *Non-self-adjoint differential operators*. Bull. London Math. Soc. **34**(5)(2002), 513–532.
- [5] M. Dimassi and J. Sjöstrand, *Spectral Asymptotics in the semi-classical limit*, Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [6] J.J. Duistermaat and J. Sjöstrand, *A global construction for pseudo-differential operators with non-involutive characteristics*, Inv. Math. **20**(1973), 209–225.
- [7] C. Fefferman, *The uncertainty principle*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **9**(1983), 129–206.
- [8] I.C. Gohberg and M. G. Krein, *Introduction to the Theory of Linear Non-self-adjoint operators*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs **18**, A.M.S., Providence, 1969.
- [9] B. Helffer and J. Sjöstrand, *Résonances en limite semi-classique. [Resonances in the semi-classical limit]* Mémoires de la S.M.F. **114**(3)(1986).
- [10] M. Hitrik, *Propagator expansions for damped wave equations*, preprint, 2001.
- [11] L. Hörmander, *Differential operators of principal type*, Math. Ann. **140**(1960), 124–146; *Differential equations without solutions*, Math. Ann. **140**(1960), 169–173.
- [12] L. Hörmander, *On the solvability of pseudodifferential equations*, in *Structure of solutions of differential equations (Katata/Kyoto, 1995)*, 183–213, World Sci. Publishing, River Edge, NJ, 1996.
- [13] L. Hörmander, *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators, vol.I,II*, Springer Verlag, 1983.
- [14] L. Hörmander, *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators, vol.III,IV*, Springer Verlag, 1985.
- [15] M. Kashiwara and T. Kawai, *Microhyperbolic pseudo-differential operators. I*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **27**(1975), 359–404.
- [16] A. Markus, *Introduction to the spectral theory of polynomial operator pencils*. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, **71**. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1988.
- [17] A. Martinez, *An introduction to semiclassical and microlocal analysis*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.
- [18] A. Martinez, *Resonance Free Domains for Non Globally Analytic Potentials*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **4**(2002), 739–756.
- [19] A. Melin and J. Sjöstrand, *Bohr-Sommerfeld quantization condition for non-selfadjoint operators in dimension 2*, preprint.
- [20] J. Sjöstrand, *Singularités analytiques microlocales*. Astérisque, **95** (1982).
- [21] J. Sjöstrand, *Resonances for bottles and trace formulæ*. Math. Nachr. **221**(2001), 95–149.
- [22] J. Sjöstrand and M. Zworski, *Quantum monodromy and semi-classical trace formulæ*, J. Math. Pure Appl. **81**(2002), 1–33.
- [23] P. Stefanov, *Quasimodes and resonances: sharp lower bounds*. Duke Math. J. **99**(1999), 75–92.
- [24] P. Stefanov and G. Vodev, *Distribution of resonances for the Neumann problem in linear elasticity outside a strictly convex body*. Duke Math. J. **78** (1995), 677–714.
- [25] S.H. Tang and M. Zworski, *From quasimodes to resonances*, Math. Res. Lett. **5**(1998), 261–272.
- [26] L.N. Trefethen, *Pseudospectra of linear operators*, Siam Review, **39**(1997), 383–400.
- [27] L.N. Trefethen, *private communication*, July, 2002.
- [28] A. Unterberger, J. Bokobza, *Les opérateurs pseudo-différentiels d'ordre variable*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **261**(1965), 2271–2273.
- [29] M. Zworski, *A remark on a paper by E.B. Davies*, Proc. A.M.S. **129**(2001), 2955–2957.

- [30] M. Zworski, *Numerical Linear Algebra and solvability of Partial Differential Equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **229**(2002)(2), 293-307.
- [31] M. Zworski, *Pseudospectra of semi-classical operators*, talk at King's College, May 2001, unpublished.

MATEMATIKCENTRUM, LUNDS UNIVERSITET, Box 118, S-221 00 LUND, SWEDEN
E-mail address: `dencker@maths.lth.se`

CENTRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES, ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE, UMR 7460, CNRS, F-91128 PALAISEAU, FRANCE
E-mail address: `johannes@math.polytechnique.fr`

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, EVANS HALL, BERKELEY, CA 94720, USA
E-mail address: `zworski@math.berkeley.edu`